arXiv:1601.07894v1 [math.DS] 28 Jan 2016

$\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$-INVARIANT MEASURES IN MARKED STRATA: GENERIC MARKED POINTS, EARLE-KRA FOR STRATA, AND ILLUMINATION

PAUL APISA

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a component of a stratum of abelian differentials and let $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ be the collection of translation surfaces in $\mathcal{H}$ together with $m+n$ distinct marked points, none coinciding with zeros, m of which are labelled and n of which are unlabelled. We show that proper affine invariant submanifolds of $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ that push forward to $\mathcal{H}$ under the forgetful map exist if and only if $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperelliptic component, in which case the affine invariant submanifolds are constructed by marking Weierstrass points and/or marking points identified under the hyperelliptic involution. In analogy to work of Earle-Kra we show that measurable equivariant sections of the forgetful map from $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ to $\mathcal{H}(0^m, \emptyset)$ exist only when $\mathcal{H}$ is hyperelliptic and are constructed by marking all Weierstrass points and/or points exchanged with one of the m labelled points under the hyperelliptic involution. As a corollary the illumination and finite blocking problems are resolved for generic translation surfaces. Combined with previous work of the author, these results provide a classification of all higher rank orbit closures in $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ when $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperelliptic component.

1. Introduction

Given a holomorphic family of Riemann surfaces is it possible to associate a holomorphically varying finite collection of points to each Riemann surface in the family? One example where this is possible is on the family of all genus two Riemann surfaces. Each genus two Riemann surface admits a canonical holomorphic involution - the hyperelliptic involution. The six fixed points of the hyperelliptic involution form a holomorphically varying collection of points on each surface in $\mathcal{M}_2$ in the sense that they provide a holomorphic section of the forgetful map $\mathcal{M}_{2,6} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$. In fact this is the only such section.

Theorem (Hubbard [6])**.** *The only holomorphic section of the forgetful map $\pi : \mathcal{M}_{g,n} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_g$ is the section of $\mathcal{M}_{2,6} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ that marks all six Weierstrass points.*

More generally, letting $\mathcal{M}_{g,m,n}$ be the moduli space of genus g smooth Riemann surfaces with $m+n$ distinct points, m labelled and n unlabelled, Earle and Kra showed the following:

Theorem (Earle-Kra [3])**.** *The only holomorphic sections of the forgetful map $\pi : \mathcal{M}_{g,m,n} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{g,m,0}$ that are defined on open dense subsets of $\mathcal{M}_{g,m}$ occur when $g = 2$ and are constructed by marking all six Weierstrass points and/or points exchanged with some of the m labelled points under the hyperelliptic involution.*

Let $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g$ be the moduli space of holomorphic one-forms on genus g Riemann surfaces. This moduli space is stratified by fixing the number of zeros of the holomorphic one-form

and their degrees of vanishing. The moduli space $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g$ may be identified as a subbundle of the space of quadratic differentials, which is naturally identified with the cotangent bundle of $\mathcal{M}_g$. There is a natural $\mathbb{C}^\times$ action on $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g$ (given by multiplying a one-form by a complex scalar) and an action of Teichmüller geodesic flow. These group actions generate a $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$ action on $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g$ that respects the stratification.

On each stratum of $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g$ there is a local coordinate system given by specifying sufficiently many periods of the holomorphic one-forms. These coordinates are called period coordinates. Transition functions for these coordinates are locally constant and given by matrices in $\mathrm{SL}_d\,\mathbb{Z}$ where d is the dimension of the stratum. This observation implies that Lebesgue measure and the notion of linearity are well-defined on each stratum. A $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$-invariant submanifold of a stratum that is locally cut out by linear equations in period coordinates is called an affine invariant submanifold.

Theorem (Eskin, Mirzakhani [4])**.** *The ergodic* $\mathrm{SL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$ *invariant probability measures on the submanifold of* $\mathcal{H}$ *containing unit area translation surfaces coincide exactly with Lebesgue measure on connected affine invariant submanifolds restricted to the submanifold of unit area translation surfaces.*

Theorem (Eskin, Mirzakhani, Mohammadi [5])**.** *Any closed invariant set in a stratum of abelian differentials is a finite union of affine invariant submanifolds.*

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stratum of abelian differentials and let $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ be the collection of translation surfaces in $\mathcal{H}$ together with $m+n$ distinct marked points, m of which are labelled and n of which are unlabelled, and none of which coincide with a zero of the underlying holomorphic one-form. In this context, we will use $|\Sigma|$ to refer to the number of zeros in $\mathcal{H}$. We are interested in studying sections of the forgetful map from $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ to $\mathcal{H}(0^m, \emptyset)$.

When the analogous problem was studied by Hubbard and Earle-Kra they viewed moduli space as a complex analytic space, and so it was natural for them to demand that their sections be holomorphic. The theorems of Eskin-Mirzakhani and Eskin-Mirzakhani-Mohammadi suggests that in our context it would be equally natural to view our spaces as spaces admitting a measurable $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$ action. From this perspective it is most natural to classify measurable $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$-equivariant sections.

Main Theorem 1. *If* $\mathcal{H}$ *is a connected component of a stratum of abelian differentials, then measurable equivariant sections of the forgetful map from* $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ *to* $\mathcal{H}(0^m, \emptyset)$ *exist if and only if* $\mathcal{H}$ *is a hyperelliptic component. These sections are formed by marking all* $2g+|\Sigma|$ *Weierstrass points that do not coincide with zeros of the abelian differential and/or by marking points exchanged with some of the* m *labelled points under the hyperelliptic involution.*

This result will follow from a classification of affine invariant submanifolds in $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$.

Main Theorem 2. *Proper affine invariant submanifolds of* $\mathcal{H}(0^n, 0^m)$ *that push forward to* $\mathcal{H}$ *under the forgetful map exist if and only if* $\mathcal{H}$ *is a hyperelliptic component, in which case the affine invariant submanifolds are constructed by marking Weierstrass points and/or marking points identified under the hyperelliptic involution.*

We view these two theorems as analogues of the theorems of Hubbard and Earle-Kra for strata of abelian differentials. However, while Hubbard and Earle-Kra established their results by studying the Banach space of L^1-quadratic differentials over Riemann surfaces, our main tools will be the Eskin-Mirzakhani correspondence between affine invariant submanifolds and finite ergodic $\mathrm{SL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$ invariant measures and an inductive argument grounded in the Mirzakhani-Wright [10] partial compactification of strata and the study of the boundary of strata undertaken in Kontsevich-Zorich [8].

The main theorems will be applied to study periodic points on generic translation surfaces, billiard problems, and to study marked points on branched covering constructions. Throughout this paper "generic" will mean generic with respect to the $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$ action on a connected component of a stratum. In the sequel, we find it convenient to shorten $\mathcal{H}(0^m, \emptyset)$ to $\mathcal{H}(0^m)$ and to shorten $\mathcal{H}(\emptyset, 0^n)$ to $\mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^n)$.

1.1. **Applications to Periodic Points on Translation Surfaces.** A point p on a translation surface (X, ω) is called a periodic point if p does not coincide with a zero of ω and the orbit closures of $(X, \omega; p)$ and (X, ω) have the same dimension. If the orbit of (X, ω) is closed then (X, ω) is called a Veech surface.

Theorem (Möller, [11])**.** *There are finitely many periodic points on a Veech surface if and only if the translation surface is not square-tiled.*

Main Theorem 2 produces an analogous result for generic translation surfaces.

Corollary 1 (Classification of Periodic Points on Generic Flat Surfaces)**.** *A generic translation surface has periodic points if and only if it belongs to a hyperelliptic component of a stratum, in which case the periodic points are Weierstrass points.*

Proof (assuming Main Theorem 2): Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a connected component of a stratum of abelian differentials and let (X, ω) be a generic translation surface in $\mathcal{H}$. Let p be any point on (X, ω) that does not coincide with a zero of ω. The orbit closure of $(X, \omega; p)$ is an affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{H}(0)$ by Eskin-Mirzakhani-Mohammadi [5]. Since (X, ω) is generic in $\mathcal{H}$, the pushforward of Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{M}$ is Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{H}$. If p is a periodic point then $\mathcal{M}$ does not coincide with $\mathcal{H}(0)$. By Main Theorem 2 this only occurs when $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperelliptic component and p is a Weierstrass point. □

The proof of following corollary is nearly identical to the previous proof.

Corollary 2. *If $\mathcal{H}$ is not a hyperelliptic component of a stratum, then any collection of distinct marked points on a generic translation surface in $\mathcal{H}$ is generic.*

1.2. **Applications to Billiards: Finite Blocking and Illumination Problems.**

The illumination problem is - given a planar domain Ω with piecewise C^1 boundary made out of mirrors, will a light source placed at any point in the domain illuminate every point in Ω? Related to the illumination problem is the finite blocking problem - under the same hypotheses when do there exist two points x and y such that there is a finite collection of points B so that if light absorbing pillars are placed at the points of B, a light source placed at x does not illuminate y?

When Ω is a rational polygon it unfolds to a translation surface (see [14] for details). The illumination problem can be restated as - when can two points on a translation surface be joined by a straight line that does not pass through any singularities of the flat metric? The finite blocking problem may be reformulated as, given two points when is there a finite collection of points B so that every straight line connecting them passes through a point in B.

Theorem (Hubert, Schmoll, Troubetzkoy [7])**.** *On a Veech surface the number of points that cannot be illuminated from a given point is finite.*

Theorem (Leliévre, Monteil, and Weiss [9])**.** *On any translation surface the number of points that cannot be illuminated from a given point is finite.*

The following theorem resolves the question of which points are finitely blocked from each other on a generic translation surface

Main Theorem 3. *On a generic translation surface every point illuminates every other. Moreover, two (not necessarily distinct) points are finitely blocked from each other if and only if the translation surface belongs to a hyperelliptic component and the two points are images of each other under the hyperelliptic involution.*

1.3. **Marked Points on Branched Covering Constructions.**

An important class of affine invariant submanifolds are those arising from branched covering constructions. Intuitively, an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ arises from a branched covering construction if every translation surface contained in $\mathcal{M}$ is the pullback of a holomorphic one-form on a lower genus surface. To formalize this intuition, $\mathcal{M}$ is an branched covering construction if there is an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{N}$ in $\mathcal{H}(0^n)$ so that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{M} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{N}$ and for every translation surface (Y, η) in $\mathcal{M}$ there is a translation surface $(X, \omega; P)$ in $\mathcal{N}$ such that $f : Y \longrightarrow X$ is a holomorphic map so that $f^*\omega = \eta$ and so f is branched over zeros of ω and points in P; we call such a map f a translation covering. In hyperelliptic components, branched covering constructions account for all affine invariant submanifolds of dimension larger than three.

Theorem (Apisa [1])**.** *An affine invariant submanifold of complex dimension at least four in a hyperelliptic component of a stratum is a branched covering construction over* $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2r-2)$ *or* $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(r-1, r-1)$ *for some integer* r*.*

For simplicity, we will suppose now that $\mathcal{M}$ is a branched covering construction of $\mathcal{N}$, an affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{H}(0^n)$ that pushes forward to $\mathcal{H}$ under the forgetful map. Given a translation covering $f : (Y, \eta) \longrightarrow (X, \omega; P)$ we will say that two points p and q on (Y, η) are f-related if either $f(p) = f(q)$ or if $\mathcal{H}$ is hyperelliptic and $f(p)$ and $f(q)$ are exchanged by the hyperelliptic involution. A point p will be called f-periodic if $f(p)$ is a periodic point on $(X, \omega; P)$ or if it maps to a point in P or a point exchanged with a point in P under the hyperelliptic involution.

Main Theorem 4. *The proper affine invariant submanifolds of* $\mathcal{M}(0^m, 0^n)$ *that push forward to* $\mathcal{M}$ *are constructed by marking* f*-periodic points and/or by marking two points that*

are f-related. All measurable equivariant sections of the forgetful map from $\mathcal{M}(0^m, 0^n)$ to $\mathcal{M}(0^m, \emptyset)$ are constructed by marking a collection of f-periodic points and/or by marking a collection of points that are f-related to one of the m labelled points.

Main Theorem 4 provides a classification of higher rank orbit closures in $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ when $\mathcal{H}$ is hyperelliptic. As above the result provides a solution to the finite blocking problem on $\mathcal{M}$-generic surfaces as well.

Corollary 3. *If (Y, η) is $\mathcal{M}$-generic and $f : (Y, \eta) \longrightarrow (X, \omega; P)$ is a translation covering where $(X, \omega; P) \in \mathcal{N}$, then two (not necessarily distinct) points p and q are finitely blocked from each other only if p and q are f-related or are both f-periodic.*

In particular, given a translation surface in $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$ or $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(g-1, g-1)$ with orbit closure of dimension four or more and a point p on the translation surface, Corollary 3 gives an explicit finite collection of points that are finitely blocked from p.

1.4. **Organization of the Paper.** Measurable equivariant maps between affine invariant submanifolds are studied in Section 2 and are analyzed in the context of maps between strata of flat surfaces with marked points in Section 3. Section 4 produces explicit generic translation surfaces in each component of every stratum. The proof of the main theorems will rely arguments involving these specific generic translation surfaces. Section 5 recalls Alex Wright's cylinder deformation theorem and derives consequences of it that will be relevant to the marked points case. Orbit closures in $\mathcal{H}(0^n)$ that push forward to $\mathcal{H}$ under the forgetful map are classified in Section 6 and Main Theorems 1 and 2 are deduced as consequences. Marked points on branched covering constructions are studied in Section 7. The finite blocking and illumination problem on generic translation surfaces are resolved in Section 8.

Acknowledgement The author gratefully acknowledges research support by the National Science Foundation through the Graduate Research Fellowship Program. He thanks Alex Eskin for suggesting the problem and he thanks Alex Eskin and Alex Wright for their insightful comments. He thanks Ronen Mukamel for suggesting the parallel between the main theorems and the work of Hubbard and Earle-Kra.

2. Affine Invariant Submanifolds

A subtlety that is often elided in defining the $\mathrm{GL}_2\mathbb{R}$ action on strata is that a level structure must be fixed. If $\Omega\mathcal{T}_g$ is the $\mathbb{C}^g$-bundle over Teichmüller space where the fiber over a point corresponding to a Riemann surface X is vector space of holomorphic one-forms on X - $H^0(X, \Omega_X)$ - then define $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g$ to be the quotient of $\Omega\mathcal{T}_g$ by the mapping class group. The fiber over a point representing a Riemann surface X in $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g$ is $H^0(X, \Omega_X)/\mathrm{Aut}(X)$. It follows that given a Riemann surface X with an automorphism f and a holomorphic one-form ω the points (X, ω) and $(X, f^*\omega)$ are identical. However, the $\mathrm{GL}_2\mathbb{R}$ actions on (X, ω) and $(X, f^*\omega)$ may be distinct.

Example 1: To illustrate the preceding point, let X be the elliptic curve with complex multiplication by $\mathbb{Z}[i]$, i.e. the projectivization of the affine variety $y^2 = x^3 + x$, and let $\omega = \frac{dx}{y}$ be an invariant differential. As a translation surface (and after normalizing), (X, ω)

is the unit square with opposite sides identified. Let f be the automorphism of X given by sending (x, y) to $(-x, iy)$. The action of f on (X, ω) sends ω to $i\omega$, i.e. the translation surface is rotated by $\frac{\pi}{2}$. Let w be a Weierstrass point (which we will identify with the center of the unit square) and let p be a point on X that is not a Weierstrass point. The points $(X - \{w, p\}, \omega)$ and $(X - \{w, f(p)\}, \omega)$ are identified in $\Omega\mathcal{M}_{1,2}$. These two translation surfaces are shown in Figure 1.



FIGURE 1. Two translation surfaces identified in $\Omega\mathcal{M}_{1,2}$

After applying Teichmüller geodesic flow, i.e. multiplying by the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} e^t & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-t} \end{pmatrix}$, the translation surfaces flow to ones shown in Figure 2.



FIGURE 2. The image of the surfaces in Figure 1 under geodesic flow are distinct

These two translation surfaces are distinct, which can be verified by checking that the $\mathbb{Z}$-linear span of the relative periods are distinct. This shows that the $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$ action is not always well-defined when (X, ω) and $(X, f^*\omega)$ are identified.

A solution to this problem is to fix a level three structure on each curve. Let $\mathcal{M}_g[3]$ be the space of smooth genus g curves together with a level three structure. The advantage of working with this space is that a smooth genus g curve with a fixed level three structure admits no automorphisms. In particular, $\mathcal{M}_g[3]$ and $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g[3]$ are smooth manifolds (not just smooth orbifolds). Since orbit closures in $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g[3]$ are affine invariant submanifolds, i.e. manifolds that are cut out by real linear equations in period coordinates, we have the following result:

Lemma 2.1. *An affine invariant submanifold in a stratum of $\Omega\mathcal{M}_g[3]$ is smooth away from points of self-intersection. The self-intersection locus will be a closed $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$-invariant submanifold, hence an affine invariant submanifold.*

In the sequel we will denote the singular locus of an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathcal{M}^{sing}$. If $f : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a map between affine invariant submanifolds then we will say that f is smooth if for every point p in $\mathcal{M}$ and every embedding $i : U \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ that is linear in period coordinates where U is an open neighborhood of 0 in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and d is the real dimension of $\mathcal{M}$ and $i(0) = p$, $f \circ i$ is smooth at 0. The map will be said to be a submersion at p if $f(p)$ is not contained in the singular locus of $\mathcal{N}$ and $f \circ i$ is a submersion at 0 for every i described above. With this definition, the collection of points in $\mathcal{M}$ at which f is a submersion is an open subset of $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 2.2 (Pushforward of an Affine Invariant Submanifold)**.** *An affine invariant submanifold may be pushed forward under a measurable equivariant map between affine invariant submanifolds.*

Proof. Let $f : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a measurable equivariant map between two affine invariant submanifolds. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an affine invariant submanifold of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\mu_{\mathcal{C}}$ be Lebesgue measure restricted to unit area translation surfaces in $\mathcal{C}$. The measure $\mu_{\mathcal{C}}$ is finite ergodic and invariant under $\mathrm{SL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$. Since f is measurable and equivariant the pushforward is also finite, ergodic, invariant under $\mathrm{SL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$, and supported on constant area translation surfaces in $\mathcal{B}$. After perhaps scaling the area of the translation surfaces in the image, we may assume without loss of generality that the image of f is supported in the collection of unit area translation surfaces. By Eskin-Mirzakhani [4] there is an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{D}$ so that Lebesgue measure on the intersection of $\mathcal{D}$ and unit area translation surfaces in $\mathcal{B}$ coincides with $f_*\mu_{\mathcal{C}}$. We will say that the pushforward of $\mathcal{C}$ is $\mathcal{D}$. □

Throughout this section a map between affine invariant submanifolds $f : \mathcal{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ will be said to "essentially" have a property if there are proper affine invariant submanifolds $C_1 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1$ and $C_2 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2$ where $f^{-1}(C_2) = C_1$ and so that the property holds for $f : \mathcal{M}_1 - C_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2 - C_2$.

Lemma 2.3 (Submersion Lemma)**.** *A smooth equivariant map between affine invariant submanifolds whose image is full measure is essentially a submersion.*

Proof. Let $g : \mathcal{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ be an equivariant map between two affine invariant submanifolds and whose image is full measure. Let F be the closed set of points in $\mathcal{M}_1$ that map to $\mathcal{M}_2^{sing}$ under g. Since $\mathcal{M}_2^{sing}$ is a codimension at least one submanifold it has Lebesgue measure zero in $\mathcal{M}_2$. Since the pushforward of $\mathcal{M}_1$ under g is $\mathcal{M}_2$ it follows that F is a closed set of Lebesgue measure zero. Throughout this proof given an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{A}$ we will denote Lebesgue measure restricted to $\mathcal{A}$ by $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Let D be the collection of critical points of g in $\mathcal{M}_1 - F$. The collection of points is closed in $\mathcal{M}_1 - F$. The image of a point in D under $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$ either lands in F or remains in D. It follows that the $\mathrm{GL}_2\,\mathbb{R}$ orbit closure $\mathcal{D}$ of D is contained in $D \cup F$. Let C_2 be the pushforward of $\mathcal{D}$ under g. By continuity $g(\mathcal{D})$ is contained in C_2 and has full measure with respect to μ_{C_2}.

By Sard's theorem, $g(D)$ has measure zero with respect to $\mu_{\mathcal{M}_2}$. We have already established that $g(F)$ has measure zero with respect to $\mu_{\mathcal{M}_2}$. Therefore, C_2 is measure zero with respect to $\mu_{\mathcal{M}_2}$. It follows that C_2 is a proper affine invariant submanifold of $\mathcal{M}_2$. Let $C_1 = g^{-1}(C_2)$, which is closed and invariant since g is continuous and equivariant. C_1 is a proper affine invariant submanifold since

$$\mu_{\mathcal{M}_1}(C_1) = \mu_{\mathcal{M}_1}\left(g^{-1}(C_2)\right) = g_*\mu_{\mathcal{M}_1}(C_2) = \mu_{\mathcal{M}_2}(C_2) = 0$$

Therefore, $g : \mathcal{M}_1 - C_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2 - C_2$ is a smooth submersion. □

Lemma 2.4 (Section Lemma)**.** *If $g : \mathcal{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ is a smooth equivariant map and there is a measurable equivariant section $f : \mathcal{M}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$, then there is an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{M}_1$ so that $g \restriction_{\mathcal{A}}$ is essentially a diffeomorphism onto $\mathcal{M}_2$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the pushforward of $\mathcal{M}_2$ under f. Since f is a section of g, $g \circ f = \mathrm{id}$ and so $\mu_{\mathcal{M}_2} = g_* f_* \mu_{\mathcal{M}_2} = g_* \mu_A$, i.e. $g : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ is a smooth equivariant map whose image is full measure in $\mathcal{M}_2$. By Lemma 2.3 there are invariant sets C_1 and C_2 so that $g : \mathcal{A} - C_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2 - C_2$ is a submersion.

By the local submersion theorem, near any point $p \in \mathcal{A} - C_1$ there is a neighborhood $U_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A} - C_1$ and $U_2 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2 - C_2$ so that there are diffeomorphisms $p_1 : U_1 \longrightarrow (0,1)^{m+k}$, $p_2 : U_2 \longrightarrow (0,1)^m$ so that $p_2 g p_1^{-1}$ is projection onto the first m-coordinates. By assumption the image of the measurable section $p_1 f p_2^{-1} : (0,1)^m \longrightarrow (0,1)^{m+k}$ has full measure. Since $p_1 f p_2^{-1}$ is a section, its image is the graph of a measurable function $(0,1)^m \longrightarrow (0,1)^k$. It follows that $k = 0$ since otherwise graphs of measurable functions have measure zero. Restated, $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ have the same dimension and so $g : \mathcal{A} - C_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2 - C_2$ is a local diffeomorphism away from the singular loci.

Now suppose to a contradiction that there is a point $p \in \mathcal{M}_2 - C_2$ with at least two preimages q_1 and q_2. Let V be a neighborhood of p in $\mathcal{M}_2 - C_2$ and let $V_i \subseteq \mathcal{A} - C_2$ be neighborhoods of q_i so that $g(V_i) = V$. Choose V so that V_1 and V_2 are disjoint. As before, g restricted to $V_1 \sqcup V_2$ is conjugate to the projection from $V \times \{0,1\}$ to V. As before, no measurable section has full measure image in $V \times \{0,1\}$ so we have a contradiction.

The collection of points in $\mathcal{M}_2$ with a unique preimage in $\mathcal{M}_1$ is open and invariant. It follows that there is an open invariant set U_2 of $\mathcal{M}_2$ whose preimage is an open invariant set U_1 in $\mathcal{A}$ and so that U_1 is contained in the complement of the critical locus and each point in U_2 has a unique preimage in $\mathcal{A}$ under g. It follows that $g : U_1 \longrightarrow U_2$ is a diffeomorphism and so $g \restriction_{\mathcal{A}}$ is essentially a diffeomorphism as desired. □

We will see now that modulo the multicomponent EMM conjecture the section and submersion lemmas imply that all measurable equivariant maps between affine invariant submanifolds are locally constant linear maps in period coordinates. The multicomponent EMM conjecture is stated precisely in Mirzakhani and Wright [10]. We will only need the following corollary:

Conjecture (Multicomponent EMM)**.** *Let $\mathcal{M}_i$ be affine invariant submanifolds for $i = 1,2,3$. Let $f : \mathcal{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_3$ be a $\mathrm{GL}_2\mathbb{R}$-equivariant measurable map. There is an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{A}$ so that Lebesgue measure restricted to $\mathcal{A}$ coincides with the pushforward under f of Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{M}_1$.*

Multicomponent EMM means that the submersion and section lemmas apply to the projections from $\mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ to $\mathcal{M}_i$ for $i = 1,2$.

Theorem 2.5. *Assuming the multicomponent EMM conjecture, measurable equivariant maps between affine invariant submanifolds are locally constant linear maps in period coordinates.*

Remark 1: This theorem should be seen as part of a long line of "closed graph theorems", which include statements like "a measurable homomorphism between topological groups is continuous", "a continuous homomorphism between Lie groups is smooth", "a map between normal projective varieties defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero is regular if and only if its graph is Zariski-closed" etc. These theorems are established by

taking a map $f : A \longrightarrow B$ and proving a "closedness" property of its graph in $A \times B$. For more examples of this phenomenon and for a more complete discussion, see Tao [12].

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ be affine invariant submanifolds and let $f : \mathcal{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ be a measurable equivariant map. Let $\pi_i : \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_i$ be the projection onto the ith factor, which is a smooth equivariant map. A measurable equivariant map $f : \mathcal{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ induces a measurable equivariant section $(\mathrm{id}, f) : \mathcal{M}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$. The section lemma indicates that there is an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\pi_1 : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$ is essentially a diffeomorphism. Therefore, around the generic point in $\mathcal{M}_1$ the map $\pi_1 : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$ is linear and locally constant in period coordinates. The local inverse must agree almost everywhere with the section (id, f). Therefore, (id, f) agrees almost everywhere with a map that is linear in period coordinates and that is defined away from a closed proper affine invariant submanifold of $\mathcal{M}_1$. Since π_2 is by definition locally linear in period coordinates, it follows that f, which is the composition of π_2 and (id, f) is also locally linear. □

This theorem indicates that - contingent on Eskin-Mirzakhani for disconnected surfaces - a measurable equivariant map is essentially a locally constant linear map (in period coordinates) that is defined on an open invariant set. Even without assuming the multicomponent EMM conjecture, this section has also allowed us to use the dimension of affine invariant submanifolds as an obstruction to producing measurable equivariant sections of bundles.

3. Affine Invariant Submanifolds in Strata with Marked Points

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{N}^{ord}(0^n)$ where $\mathcal{N}$ is an affine invariant submanifold potentially with marked points. Let $\pi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be the forgetful map and suppose without loss of generality that $\pi_*\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}$ (if this were not the case then we would simply replace $\mathcal{N}$ by the pushforward of $\mathcal{M}$).

Proposition 3.1. *If $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{M} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{N}$, then $\pi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a finite map and the map that sends a point in $\mathcal{N}$ to the size of its fiber in $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded and lower semicontinuous.*

Proof. Let $\overline{\mathcal{N}(0^n)}$ be the partial compactification of $\mathcal{N}(0^n)$ where marked points are allowed to coincide with each other and with zeros. Let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ be the closure of $\mathcal{M}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{N}(0^n)}$. The map $\pi : \overline{\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a proper surjection onto $\mathcal{N}$. Define the boundary of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ to be $\overline{\mathcal{M}} - \mathcal{M}$. By Mirzakhani-Wright [10], the dimension of the boundary is strictly smaller than the dimension of $\mathcal{M}$. The submersion lemma implies that the pushforward of the boundary is a closed invariant set F. Therefore, $\mathcal{M} - \pi^{-1}(F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N} - F$ is a proper map that is submersion away from the singular locus of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. Suppose without loss of generality that F contains the singular locus of $\mathcal{N}$ and the pushforward of the singular locus of $\mathcal{M}$ (which is not all of $\mathcal{N}$ since its dimension is strictly smaller than that of $\mathcal{M}$). Therefore, $\mathcal{M} - \pi^{-1}(F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N} - F$ is a proper smooth surjective submersion and hence a finite covering map.

Suppose now to a contradiction that there is a point x in F so that the fiber over F contains more than d points where d is the degree of the cover $\mathcal{M} - \pi^{-1}(F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N} - F$. Find $d+1$ distinct points $(y_i)_{i=1}^{d+1}$ in the fiber and let v be a tangent vector at x that is not tangent to F. Since π is a submersion almost everywhere and is locally a constant linear

map in period coordinates we may lift the tangent vector v to a tangent vector v_i at each y_i. The flow from y_i in the v_i direction is locally well-defined. Therefore, there is some point x' in $\mathcal{N} - F$ whose fiber contains $d+1$ points in it, which is a contradiction. It follows that the fiber above every point in $\mathcal{N}$ has at most d points and that $\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a finite map. Since the map is finite we may now apply the previous argument to $\pi^{-1}(F) \longrightarrow F$ to establish lower semicontinuity of the map that sends a point in $\mathcal{N}$ to the size of its fiber. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let $k = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{M} - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{N}$. The forgetful map $\pi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ factors as $\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{N}^{ord}(0^k) \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{N}$ where f is a finite map and p is the forgetful map.*

Proof. Proceed by induction on k. The base case, $k = 0$, is Proposition 3.1. Now suppose that the result holds for $k-1$. We will show that it holds for k. Suppose first that there is an integer i in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} (\pi_i)_* \mathcal{M} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{M}$. It follows from Proposition 3.1 that $\pi_i : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}^{ord}(0^{n-1})$ is a finite map over its image. Now the induction hypothesis completes the proof in this case. Suppose instead that for each integer i in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} (\pi_i)_* \mathcal{M} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{M} - 1$. This implies that the ith marked point may be moved independently of all others for all i. Therefore, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}^{ord}(0^k)$. □

4. Generic Surfaces in Each Component of Every Stratum

In this section we will construct explicit generic translation surfaces in each connected component of every stratum of abelian differentials. The connected components were classified by Kontsevich and Zorich [8].

Theorem (Kontsevich-Zorich [8])**.** *All strata are connected except for the following:*

- *For $g > 3$, $\mathcal{H}(2g-2)$ has three connected components characterized by odd spin, even spin, and hyperellipticity.*
- *For odd $g > 3$, $\mathcal{H}(g-1, g-1)$ has three connected components characterized by odd spin, even spin, and hyperellipticity.*
- *For even $g > 3$, $\mathcal{H}(g-1, g-1)$ has two connected components characterized by hyperellipticity and nonhyperellipticity.*
- *For $g > 3$, $\mathcal{H}(2k_1, \ldots, 2k_n)$ has two connected components characterized by odd and even spin (excluding the case $\mathcal{H}(g-1, g-1)$ for odd $g > 3$, which, as mentioned above, has three components).*
- *$\mathcal{H}(4)$ and $\mathcal{H}(2,2)$ have two connected components - a hyperelliptic and an odd one.*

To distinguish which connected component of a stratum a specific translation surface belongs to, we will use the following criterion.

Theorem (Corollary 2, Kontsevich-Zorich [8])**.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stratum of abelian differentials. For each connected component C of the minimal stratum there is a unique component of $\mathcal{H}$ that contains C in its closure.*

We are now in a position to create horizontally and vertically periodic translation surfaces in each component of each stratum. First, we establish a convention:

Important Convention: We will often use polygons, all of whose edges will be vertical or horizontal, to represent translation surfaces using the following two conventions. The

edge of a polygon will mean a line segment in the boundary of the polygon that connects two vertices and has no vertex in its interior.

(1) The intersection of a dotted line and an edge is a vertex of the polygon.
(2) If a pair of unmarked vertical (resp. horizontal) edges contain interior points that can be connected by a horizontal (resp. vertical) line that lies in the interior of the polygon then they are identified.

Under this convention the two translation surfaces in Figure 3 are identical:



FIGURE 3. Equivalent representations of the same translation surface

Using separatrix diagrams, Kontsevich and Zorich produce surfaces that belong to each component of the minimal stratum (see Figure 4 of [8]). The surfaces are represented as translation surfaces in Figure 4.



(A) $\mathcal{H}^{odd}(2g-2)$ (B) $\mathcal{H}^{even}(2g-2)$ (C) $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$

FIGURE 4. Surfaces in each component of the minimal stratum

Proposition 4.1 (Genericity Criterion)**.** *Suppose that (X,ω) is a translation surface in a component $\mathcal{H}$ of a stratum of abelian differentials of genus g surfaces with n zeros and no marked points. If (X,ω) has $g+n-1$ horizontal cylinders whose moduli satisfy no rational linear relation, then (X,ω) is generic.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the orbit closure of (X,ω). It suffices to show that $\mathcal{M}$ coincides with a component of $\mathcal{H}$. By Wright's cylinder deformation theorem [13] since the moduli satisfy no rational linear relation the tangent space of $\mathcal{M}$ at (X,ω) includes $\{\gamma_1^*,\ldots,\gamma_{g+n-1}^*\}$ where γ_i are core curves oriented from left to right of the horizontal cylinders and γ_i^* denotes the dual cohomology class under the intersection pairing. For details on the identification of $T_{(X,\omega)}\mathcal{M}$ with a subspace of $H^1(X,\Sigma;\mathbb{C})$, for Σ the zero set of ω, see Avila, Eskin, Möller [2]. The dual cohomology classes span a complex vector space of dimension $g+n-1$.

Let $p : T_{(X,\omega)}\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow H^1(X,\mathbb{C})$ be the projection from relative to absolute cohomology. By Avila, Eskin, Möller [2] the image of the projection is a complex symplectic vector

space. The kernel of the projection has (complex) dimension at most $n-1$. Since the projection of $\{\gamma_1^*, \ldots, \gamma_{g+n-1}^*\}$ spans an isotropic subspace, which has dimension at most g, it follows that the kernel of p has dimension exactly $n-1$ and that the projection of $\{\gamma_1^*, \ldots, \gamma_{g+n-1}^*\}$ spans a Lagrangian subspace. Since $p\left(T_{(X,\omega)}\mathcal{M}\right)$ is complex symplectic it follows that p is a surjection with maximal dimensional kernel. It follows that $T_{(X,\omega)}\mathcal{M}$ is isomorphic to $H^1(X, \Sigma; \mathbb{C})$ and hence that $\mathcal{M}$ has full dimension. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is open and closed it must coincide with a component of $\mathcal{H}$. □

Generic Surfaces in $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(g-1, g-1)$.

It is straightforward to verify that the translation surfaces in Figure 5 are in the indicated components; see for example Section 2 of [1]. The genericity criterion implies that the translation surfaces are generic provided that all moduli of horizontal cylinders satisfy no rational linear relation.



(A) $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$ (B) $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(g-1, g-1)$

FIGURE 5. Hyperelliptic Translation Surfaces

Generic Surfaces in Even Components of Strata.

To find a surface in $\mathcal{H}^{even}(2k_1, \ldots, 2k_n)$ start with the surface in Figure 6 taking $g = 1 + \sum_i k_i$ and then collapse every a_i except those in $S := \{a_0, a_{k_1}, a_{k_1+k_2}, \ldots, a_{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} k_i}\}$. This surface is in the even component since collapsing $S - \{a_0\}$ is a path in the stratum whose endpoint is a surface in the even minimal component (specifically the surface in Figure 4b). By the genericity criterion whenever the vertical cylinders have rationally unrelated moduli this surface is generic.



FIGURE 6. $\mathcal{H}^{even}(2, \ldots, 2)$

Generic Surfaces in Remaining Components. To find generic surfaces in all other connected components of the remaining strata we glue together copies of



(A) $\mathcal{H}(\ldots, 2r, \ldots)$



(B) $\mathcal{H}(\ldots, 2n+1, 2m+1, \ldots)$

FIGURE 7. Surfaces in $\mathcal{H}^{odd}$, $\mathcal{H}^{nonhyp}$, and connected strata

cyclically along the central horizontal cylinder. By the genericity criterion whenever the vertical cylinders have rationally unrelated moduli this surface is generic.

5. Cylinder Deformation Theorems for Strata of Marked Points

In the previous section we produced generic translation surfaces in every component of every stratum. The surfaces we produced were consciously selected to have many horizontal and vertical cylinders in order to exploit cylinder deformation theorems. In this section we will summarize the cylinder deformation theorems that we will use and apply them to study of marked points on translation surfaces.

Throughout this section $\mathcal{M}$ will be an affine invariant submanifold in a component $\mathcal{H}$ of a stratum of abelian differentials without marked points. If (X, ω) is a translation surface in $\mathcal{M}$ and C and D are two horizontal cylinders with core curves γ_C and γ_D, then we will say that C and D are $\mathcal{M}$-parallel (or $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent) if γ_C and γ_D are parallel on all translation surfaces in some $\mathcal{M}$-neighborhood of (X, ω). It will always be the case that if γ_C and γ_D are homologous then the corresponding cylinders will be $\mathcal{M}$-parallel. This follows from the observation that the period of a simple closed curve only depends on its homology class. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an entire stratum, then two cylinders are $\mathcal{M}$-parallel if and only if their core curves are rational multiples of each other in homology. However, when $\mathcal{M}$ is a proper affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{M}$-parallelism may be more complicated. When C is a cylinder and there are no other $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent cylinders we say that C is $\mathcal{M}$-free.

Given a collection $\mathcal{C}$ of horizontal cylinders on a translation surface (X, ω) in $\mathcal{M}$, one way to produce another translation surface that belongs to the same stratum is to shear each cylinder in $\mathcal{C}$ by the matrix $u_t := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. This deformation is the same as the time one

flow along the tangent vector given by $u_t := t \cdot \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} h_c \gamma_c^*$ where h_c is the height of cylinder c, γ_c is the homology class of the core curve of cylinder c oriented left to right, and γ_c^* is the cohomology class dual to γ_c. A potential problem in using this deformation is that it need not produce another translation surface in $\mathcal{M}$. When this deformation applied to $\mathcal{C}$ always produces a translation surface in $\mathcal{M}$ we say that $\mathcal{C}$ may be horizontally sheared.

A similar construction is to take the cylinders in $\mathcal{C}$ and dilate them by the matrix $a_t := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^t \end{pmatrix}$. If this deformation remains in $\mathcal{M}$ for all t then we say that $\mathcal{C}$ may be vertically dilated. Again, there is a priori no reason why such a deformation should remain in $\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 5.1 (Cylinder Deformation Theorem, Wright [13])**.** *Vertically dilating and horizontally shearing an $\mathcal{M}$-equivalence class of horizontal cylinders on a translation surface in $\mathcal{M}$ remains in $\mathcal{M}$.*

The following result is contained in the proof of Theorem 7.1, Wright [13].

Theorem 5.2 (Wright [13])**.** *Two cylinders C and D are $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent if and only if there are nonzero constants a and b so that $\mathcal{M}$ locally satisfies the equation $a\gamma_C^* = b\gamma_D^*$*

We will show that when marked points are added to a translation surface, equivalence classes change in the simplest possible way. For the remainder of the section let (X, ω) be a translation surface with orbit closure $\mathcal{M}$. Let P be a collection of marked points on (X, ω) and let $\mathcal{M}'$ be the orbit closure of $(X, \omega; P)$.

Lemma 5.3. *Two cylinders C and D are $\mathcal{M}'$-equivalent if and only if they are contained in $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent cylinders.*

Proof. Two cylinder C and D are $\mathcal{M}'$-equivalent if and only if there are constants a and b so that $\mathcal{M}'$ satisfies the equation $a\gamma_C^* = b\gamma_D^*$ in a neighborhood of $(X, \omega; P)$. Since this is an equation on absolute homology, this equation holds if and only if $a\gamma_C^* = b\gamma_D^*$ holds in an $\mathcal{M}$-neighborhood of (X, ω), i.e. if and only if C and D are contained in $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent cylinders. □

One way to transform one translation surface with marked points into another is to apply the matrix u_t to all cylinders in an $\mathcal{M}$-equivalence class $\mathcal{C}$. The marked points are moved by the matrix u_t. A priori it is not clear that this transformation takes a point in $\mathcal{M}'$ to a point in $\mathcal{M}'$. The cylinder deformation theorem guarantees that, forgetting the marked points, the underlying unmarked translation surface remains in $\mathcal{M}$, but does not promise that the marked translation surface moves to another point in $\mathcal{M}'$. We will call this transformation horizontally shearing an $\mathcal{M}$-equivalence class on $\mathcal{M}'$. The preceding lemma proves that if $\{C_1, \ldots, C_m\}$ are the cylinders in $(X, \omega; P)$ contained in $\mathcal{C}$, then the tangent space of $\mathcal{M}'$ at $(X, \omega; P)$ contains the tangent vector $\sum_{i=1}^{m} h_{C_i} \gamma_{C_i}^*$, which is equivalent to saying that shearing an $\mathcal{M}$-equivalence class of cylinders on $\mathcal{M}'$ remains in $\mathcal{M}'$.

Corollary 5.4. *Horizontally shearing and vertically dilating an $\mathcal{M}$-equivalence class of horizontal cylinders on $\mathcal{M}'$ remains in $\mathcal{M}'$.*

The height h of a point p in a horizontal cylinder C on (X, ω) is defined to be the distance from the bottom boundary of C to p. The point p is said to lie at rational height in C if $\frac{h_p}{h_c}$ is rational.

Lemma 5.5 (Rational Height Lemma)**.** *Suppose that P consists of a single point p and that p is a periodic point. Suppose furthermore that p is contained in the interior of a horizontal cylinder C and that all cylinders $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent to C have a rational ratio of moduli; then p has rational height in C.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the $\mathcal{M}$-equivalence class of cylinders containing C. By Corollary 5.4 we may shear $\mathcal{C}$ on $\mathcal{M}'$. Let v be the tangent vector corresponding to this transformation. Since all the cylinders in $\mathcal{C}$ have a rational ratio of moduli, there is a real number r so that the unit time flow along $r \cdot v$ is a Dehn multi-twist in the cylinders in $\mathcal{C}$. In particular, the translation surface (X, ω) is taken back to itself. By Proposition 3.1 the fiber of $\mathcal{M}'$ above (X, ω) contains finitely many points and therefore p has finite orbit under the shear given by $r \cdot v$. It follows that p has rational height. □

6. Classification of Affine Invariant Submanifolds in $\mathcal{H}(0^n)$ that push forward to $\mathcal{H}$

In this section we will classify the affine invariant submanifolds in $\mathcal{H}(0^n)$ that push forward to $\mathcal{H}$ when $\mathcal{H}$ is a component of a stratum of abelian differentials. First we will recall some of the special features of the translation surfaces that we constructed in Section 4 in nonhyperelliptic components. On the surfaces constructed in those components there is a unique horizontal cylinder, which we will call the central horizontal cylinder, that intersects every vertical cylinder. Whenever two vertical cylinders have homologous core curves, they are both contained in the central horizontal cylinder. Since we are working in an entire component of a stratum two cylinders are $\mathcal{H}$-parallel if and only if their core curves are homologous. In fact, by construction there is at most one $\mathcal{H}$-equivalence class $\mathcal{V}$ of vertical cylinders with more than one cylinder. By construction the central horizontal cylinder is an $\mathcal{H}$-free horizontal cylinder that is always simply intersected by two $\mathcal{H}$-free vertical cylinders.

As a caveat, the claim that the central horizontal cylinder is simply intersected by two $\mathcal{H}$-free vertical cylinders will not be true for surfaces in $\mathcal{H}(1,1)$, $\mathcal{H}^{even}(4)$, or $\mathcal{H}^{even}(2,2)$ constructed using the construction in Section 4 of translation surfaces in an even or general component of a stratum. However, those strata all coincide with hyperelliptic components of strata and so we exclude them by considering hyperelliptic and nonhyperelliptic components separately. On the surfaces constructed in hyperelliptic components, all horizontal and vertical cylinders are free and $g-1$ of them simply intersect two $\mathcal{H}$-free vertical cylinders.

Lemma 6.1. *Let (X, ω) be a translation surface in an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ that contains an $\mathcal{M}$-free horizontal cylinder C that is simply intersected by two $\mathcal{M}$-free vertical cylinders D_1 and D_2. If q is a periodic point in the interior of C, then up to relabelling D_1 and D_2 the situation is as in Figure 8:*



FIGURE 8. An $\mathcal{M}$-free horizontal cylinder simply intersected by two $\mathcal{M}$-free vertical cylinders

where $a = b$ *and* $p = h = \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Since C is $\mathcal{M}$-free we may rescale it to have unit height while fixing the rest of the translation surface. The rational height lemma says that as we perform this deformation the height of the periodic point remains rational and hence constant. Let $\mathcal{M}'$ be the orbit closure of $(X, \omega; q)$. Corollary 5.4 says that if the marked points divides C into two cylinders C_1 and C_2, then the tangent space of $\mathcal{M}'$ at $(X, \omega; q)$ contains the tangent vector $h_1\gamma^*_{C_1} + h_2\gamma^*_{C_2}$ where h_i is the height of cylinder C_i. The time one flow along this tangent vector is equivalent to performing one complete Dehn twist around the curve γ_C.

Either the periodic point is contained in D_1 or if not, since D_1 is $\mathcal{M}$-free and simply intersects C, we may dilate D_1 and shear C so that the periodic point lands in the interior of D_1. The situation is now as in Figure 8 and we will call the resulting marked translation surface (Y, η, q').

By symmetry we may now dilate D_2 so that shearing C forces the periodic point to land in the interior of D_2. The periodic point lands at height $\dfrac{h\,(\ell_1 + \ell_2 + a + b) - (1-p)\ell_1 - a}{\ell_2}$ in D_2, which must be rational by the rational height lemma. Here height means height in D_2, i.e. the distance from the left hand boundary of D_2 to the marked point (relative to the distance between the two boundaries of D_2). Since this ratio must be rational for all sufficiently small perturbations of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2, it follows that $h = (1-p)$ and $h(a+b) = a$. By symmetry we may apply the argument again to conclude that $h(a+b) = b$, from which it follows that $a = b$ and $h = p = \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, (Y, η, q') is a translation surface as in Figure 8 and subject to the conditions $a = b$ and $p = h = \frac{1}{2}$ as desired.

To pass from (Y, η, q') back to $(X, \omega; q)$ we must perhaps shear the cylinder C and then alter D_1 so that it returns to its original size. This shows that after perhaps swapping the labels of D_1 and D_2 that $(X, \omega; q)$ is as pictured in Figure 8. □

Lemma 6.1 is already powerful enough to identify all periodic points in $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(g-1, g-1)$.

Proposition 6.2. *The periodic points on $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(g-1,g-1)$ are exactly the Weierstrass points.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be either $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$ or $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(g-1,g-1)$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{H}(0)$ that pushes forward to $\mathcal{H}$ under the forgetful map and so that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{M} = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 3.1 the fiber of the map $\pi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ over a generic translation surface is nonempty and has largest possible size. Therefore, it suffices to show that the only periodic points on (X,ω) are Weierstrass points where (X,ω) is a generic translation surface constructed in Section 4, pictured again in Figure 9



(A) $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$ (B) $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(g-1,g-1)$

FIGURE 9. Hyperelliptic Translation Surfaces

Recall that all horizontal and vertical cylinders are $\mathcal{M}$-free. Therefore, by Lemma 6.1 if p lies in the interior of a horizontal cylinder that intersects two vertical cylinders, it is automatically a Weierstrass point. The same holds if it lies in the interior of a vertical cylinder that intersects two horizontal ones. We may therefore assume (up to exchanging each instance of the word "horizontal" for the word "vertical" and vice versa) that p lies in the interior of a horizontal cylinder that simply intersects one vertical cylinder and on the boundary of a vertical cylinder. Shearing the horizontal cylinder containing the periodic point then moves the periodic point into the interior of a vertical cylinder that intersects two horizontal cylinders and we have that p is a Weierstrass point. □

Suppose now that unless otherwise indicated (X,ω) is a translation surface constructed in Section 4 in a nonhyperelliptic component of a stratum.

Proposition 6.3. *A periodic point on (X,ω) must lie on the boundary of the central horizontal cylinder and in the interior of a vertical cylinder that is not $\mathcal{H}$-free.*

Proof. Let p be a periodic point in (X,ω). Lemma 6.1 already tells us that the interior of the central horizontal cylinder C does not contain any periodic points.

Suppose first that the periodic point is contained in the interior of a vertical cylinder that is not entirely contained in C. If the vertical cylinder intersects the central horizontal cylinder exactly once, then Lemma 6.1 implies that there is a periodic point in the interior of C, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we may suppose that the vertical cylinder intersects the central horizontal cylinder twice (which only occurs on the surfaces that we constructed in the even component). Lemma 6.1 implies that the periodic point must lie at height $\frac{1}{2}$ in

both the vertical and the horizontal cylinders that contain it. By shearing the horizontal cylinder containing the marked point as in Figure 10 we see that Lemma 6.1 again implies that there is a periodic point contained in the interior of the central horizontal cylinder, which is a contradiction. We conclude that the periodic point cannot be contained in the interior of a vertical cylinder not entirely contained in C.



FIGURE 10. Moving potentially periodic points into the interior of C

Suppose now to a contradiction that p is contained in the interior of a horizontal cylinder that is not the central horizontal cylinder. All horizontal cylinders intersect either one or two vertical cylinders by construction and all intersections are simple. If the horizontal cylinder containing p intersects two vertical cylinders, then Lemma 6.1 implies that p is contained in the interior of a vertical cylinder V. If the horizontal cylinder only intersects a single vertical cylinder, then Corollary 5.4 indicates that the horizontal cylinder may be sheared so that p is moved to a periodic point in the interior of a vertical cylinder. In both instances we have reached a contradiction. We conclude a periodic point p must lie on the boundary of C.

Suppose to a contradiction that p lies on the boundary of C and on the boundary of a vertical cylinder. Points on the boundary of C that are also on the boundary of a vertical cylinder only exist when $\mathcal{H}$ is an even component. The points are shown in Figure 11.



FIGURE 11. Points on the boundary of C and on the boundary of a vertical cylinder

The horizontal cylinders marked H and H' are $\mathcal{H}$-free and so is the vertical cylinder marked V. By Corollary 5.4 we may shear H and H' and horizontally dilate V to arrive at the translation surface shown in Figure 12



FIGURE 12. Moving potentially periodic points into the interior of C

These two points cannot be periodic by Lemma 6.1. It follows that a periodic point contained on the boundary of C lies in vertical cylinder V that is contained in C. If V is $\mathcal{M}$-free, then Corollary 5.4 implies that the marked point may be moved to a periodic point in the interior of C, which is a contradiction. Therefore, p lies on the boundary of C and is contained in the interior of V, which is not $\mathcal{M}$-free. □

Corollary 6.4. *The only component of $\mathcal{H}(2g-2)$ with periodic points is $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$.*

Proof. If (Y,η) is a generic translation surface in a nonhyperelliptic component $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{H}(2g-2)$ with a periodic point p, then let $\mathcal{M}$ be its orbit closure in $\mathcal{H}(0)$. By Proposition 3.1 the fiber of $\mathcal{M}$ over a generic translation surface in $\mathcal{H}$ is nonempty and contains periodic points. In particular, this implies that there are periodic points on (X,ω), which is not possible by Proposition 6.3 □

This corollary is our first hint that the only components of strata with periodic points are hyperelliptic ones. By Kontsevich-Zorich [8] every component of a stratum contains a component of the minimal stratum in its boundary. Every component except $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(g-1,g-1)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{hyp}(2g-2)$ is adjacent to a nonhyperelliptic component of the minimal stratum (which we have just shown contains no periodic points). This suggests that a degeneration argument would allow us to classify periodic points. This is exactly how we will proceed.

As observed in Mirzakhani-Wright [10], degenerating translation surfaces often leads to boundary translation surfaces with marked points. Therefore, somewhat paradoxically, in order to classify periodic points in connected components of strata, we must first study the case of multiple marked points.

Proposition 6.5. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a proper affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^n)$ where $n \geq 2$ and suppose that $(\pi_i)_* \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^{n-1})$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ where π_i is the map that forgets the ith marked point. Then $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperelliptic component and $\mathcal{M}$ is the affine invariant submanifold consisting of translation surfaces $(X,\omega;p,q)$ where p and q are two points exchanged by the hyperelliptic involution.*

Proof. Let (X,ω) be a generic translation surface constructed in Section 4 and let $P = \{p_1,\dots,p_{n-1}\}$ be $n-1$ marked points lying in the interior of the central horizontal cylinder C at irrational heights that admit no rational linear relation. If $\mathcal{H}$ is hyperelliptic, then we will simply take C to be any horizontal cylinder that intersects two vertical cylinders. Since $(X,\omega;P)$ is generic it follows that the fiber over it in $\mathcal{M}$ is nonempty. Let $(X,\omega;P\cup\{p_n\})$ be a point in the fiber.

We will begin by showing that it is not possible for one marked point to move around the fiber while the remaining $n-1$ marked points are fixed. Suppose to a contradiction that

(without loss of generality) p_n may be moved around the fiber while all other marked points are fixed. The fiber of the map $\pi_n : \mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^{n-1})$ over $(X, \omega; P)$ is isomorphic $(X - P)^n$. Since p_n may be moved around the fiber it follows that the tangent space of $\mathcal{M}$ at $(X, \omega; P)$ contains a copy of the tangent space of $(X - P)$ coming from the nth marked point. However, this is precisely the kernel of $d\pi_n$ contradicting the fact that π_n is a local diffeomorphism.

We will now show that $n = 2$. By construction there are two $\mathcal{H}$-free cylinders D_1 and D_2 that intersect C (for a picture see Figure 8). Since the points in P were arbitrary (as long as $(X, \omega; P)$ is generic in $\mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^{n-1})$), if $n > 2$ then we may place p_1 in the interior of D_1 at irrational height and place $p_2, \ldots, p_{n-1}$ in the interior of D_2 at irrational heights that are rationally unrelated. Choose i so that D_i does not contain p_n. By Corollary 5.4 we may shear D_i. Since the marked points lie at irrational rationally unrelated heights we see that each marked point in D_i may be moved while fixing the remaining marked points; this is a contradiction.

Therefore, suppose that p_1 is a marked point contained in the interior of C and D_1 and lying at irrational height in both cylinders. It follows that p_2 is also contained in the interior of C and D_1 since otherwise it would be possible to (by shearing) to move p_1 independently of p_2. Furthermore, p_2 lies at irrational height in both cylinders since otherwise p_2 is fixed by a finite power of a complete Dehn twist, whereas p_1 would have a dense orbit on the core curve passing through it. This would imply that p_1 could be moved independently of p_2, a contradiction.

This argument shows that p_1 lies in the interior of C if and only if p_2 does. The same holds in the cylinder D_1. Moving p_1 to the left we see that p_1 reaches the left boundary of D_1 at the same moment that p_2 reaches the boundary. Now reversing direction and moving p_1 to the right we see again that p_1 and p_2 arrive at the boundary of D_1 at the same moment. This implies either that one point lies above the other and both move at the same speed in the same direction (horizontally) or that both points at some point were on opposite boundaries of D_1 and move in opposite directions (horizontally) at the same speed. The first case cannot occur, since if it does we may simply shear the central horizontal cylinder and find two marked points that do not lie above each other and that still move in the same direction at the same speed. The same argument applied to the vertical direction shows that when one point moves at unit speed in the v direction, the other point moves at unit speed in the $-v$ direction. Coupled with the fact that the points arrive at the D_1 and C boundary at the same times we have that when $\mathcal{H}$ is hyperelliptic the two points are exchanged by the hyperelliptic involution.

We will now show that $\mathcal{H}$ must be hyperelliptic. The present situation is pictured in Figure 13.



FIGURE 13. Two marked points in the central horizontal cylinder

If $\mathcal{H}$ is not hyperelliptic then we may ensure that $a < b$. If p_2 moves to the right at unit speed, then p_1 moves to the left at unit speed and hence p_2 arrives in the interior of D_2 before p_1, which contradicts the fact that p_1 is in the interior of D_2 if and only if p_2 is. □

Theorem 6.6. *A generic translation surface has a periodic point if and only if it is contained in a hyperelliptic component of a stratum; in which case, the periodic points are Weierstrass points.*

We will temporarily defer the proof of Theorem 6.6 and deduce a corollary first.

Theorem 6.7. *The only affine invariant submanifolds of $\mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^n)$ that push forward to $\mathcal{H}$ are $\mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^n)$ and, in the case that $\mathcal{H}$ is hyperelliptic, nonempty intersections of the following affine invariant submanifolds:*

$$\mathcal{H}_{ij}(0^n) = \{(X, \omega; p_1, \ldots, p_n) : Jp_i = p_j\}$$

where $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ are not necessarily distinct and where J is the hyperelliptic involution on (X, ω). The affine invariant submanifolds of $\mathcal{H}(0^n)$ that push forward to $\mathcal{H}$ are symmetrizations of these affine invariant submanifolds.

Proof of Theorem 6.7 assuming Theorem 6.6: Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^n)$ that does not coincide with $\mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^n)$. Proceed by induction on n. The $n = 1$ case was established in Theorem 6.6. Suppose now that $n > 1$.

If for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\dim(\pi_k)_*\mathcal{M} = \dim \mathcal{M} - 1$, then by the inductive hypothesis $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperelliptic component and $(\pi_k)_*\mathcal{M} = \bigcap_{(i,j)\in S} \mathcal{H}_{ij}(0^{n-1})$. It follows that $\mathcal{M}$ is contained in $\bigcap_{(i,j)\in S} \mathcal{H}_{ij}(0^n)$ and therefore coincides with it since both manifolds are connected, closed, and of the same dimension.

Suppose now that $\dim(\pi_i)_*\mathcal{M} = \dim \mathcal{M}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. If $\dim \mathcal{M} < \dim \mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^{n-1})$ then $(\pi_1)_*\mathcal{M} = \bigcap_{(i,j)\in S} \mathcal{H}_{ij}(0^{n-1})$ where S is nonempty. It follows that $\mathcal{M}$ is contained in $\bigcap_{(i,j)\in S} \mathcal{H}_{ij}(0^n)$. Suppose without loss of generality that $(2, j) \in S$ and so $(\pi_2)_*\mathcal{M} = \bigcap_{(i,j)\in T} \mathcal{H}_{ij}(0^{n-1})$

where T is not contained in S. In particular, T contains at least one ordered pair not contained in S. Hence, $\mathcal{M} = \bigcap_{(i,j)\in S\cup T} \mathcal{H}_{ij}(0^n)$ since both manifolds are connected, closed, and of the same dimension.

The only case that remains to analyze is the case when $(\pi_i)_*\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H}^{ord}(0^{n-1})$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, but that case was already studied in Proposition 6.5. □

Proof of Theorem 6.6: Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a component of a stratum of abelian differentials. Proceed by induction on $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{H}$. The result has already been established for hyperelliptic components (Proposition 6.2), which establishes the base case, and allows us to assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{H}$ is not a hyperelliptic component.

If (Z, ζ) is a generic translation surface with a periodic point p, then let $\mathcal{M}$ be its orbit closure in $\mathcal{H}(0)$. By Proposition 3.1 the fiber of $\mathcal{M}$ over a generic translation surface in $\mathcal{H}$ is nonempty and contains periodic points. In particular, (X, ω) contains a periodic point. By Proposition 6.3 there is a vertical cylinder V contained in the central horizontal cylinder C so that the periodic point is contained in the interior of V and on the boundary of C. The situation is depicted in Figure 14. Let V_a and V_b be the two (respectively left and right) vertical cylinders into which the marked point divides V.



FIGURE 14. The periodic point p

First suppose that C contains an $\mathcal{M}$-free vertical cylinder W (in fact all we need is that W may be collapsed while fixing the rest of the marked translation surface). For instance, this occurs whenever (X, ω) contains an odd order zero. In that case, the situation is pictured in Figure 15.



FIGURE 15. An $\mathcal{H}$-free cylinder W

One zero is portrayed as a black circle and another as a white one. Since W is $\mathcal{H}$-free and does not contain a marked point it remains $\mathcal{M}$-free and hence may be collapsed while fixing p. This identifies the two distinct zeros and passes to a translation surface of the same genus in a stratum $\mathcal{H}'$ of dimension one less than $\mathcal{H}$. This boundary translation surface (Y, η) is generic by the genericity criterion and contains a marked point p' that is the image of p under the cylinder collapse. Let $\mathcal{M}'$ be the orbit closure of $(Y, \eta; p')$. By Mirzakhani-Wright, the dimension of $\mathcal{M}'$ is strictly less than the dimension of $\mathcal{M}$. However,

since the orbit closure of (Y, η) is $\mathcal{H}'$, it follows that p' is a periodic point on a surface (Y, η) that is generic in $\mathcal{H}'$.

By the induction hypothesis, p' is a Weierstrass point and $\mathcal{H}'$ is a hyperelliptic component. If this is the case, then V is invariant under the hyperelliptic involution and so the modulus of V_a is equal to the modulus of V_b. This equality holds on $(X, \omega; p)$. It follows that $h_a\gamma_a^* + h_b\gamma_b^*$ is a tangent vector to $\mathcal{M}$ at $(X, \omega; p)$. The time one flow along this tangent vector is a complete Dehn twist that moves the periodic point to the interior of the central horizontal cylinder, which is a contradiction. Therefore, (X, ω) cannot contain an $\mathcal{M}$-free vertical cylinder in C. As a corollary, (X, ω) cannot have an odd order zero.

Suppose now that (X, ω) lies in an even component that does not coincide with a hyperelliptic one. In particular, the genus of X is at least four. Let W be one of the two vertical cylinders that intersect the central horizontal cylinder twice. After shearing the two $\mathcal{M}$-free horizontal cylinders that intersect W and do not coincide with C - call them H and H' - the situation is pictured in Figure 16.



FIGURE 16. Degenerating a translation surface in an even component

Since H is $\mathcal{M}$-free we may collapse it while fixing p and V. The collapse does not produce any marked points and the resulting boundary translation surface (Y, η) lives in a stratum $\mathcal{H}'$ of one dimension less. In particular, a zero of order $2k + 2$ splits into a zero of order 1 and a zero of order $2k - 1$ for some integer $k > 1$. The boundary translation surface is pictured in Figure 17.



FIGURE 17. The boundary translation surface (Y, η)

Let $\mathcal{M}'$ be the orbit closure of $(Y, \eta; p)$. By the genericity criterion, (Y, η) remains generic. By Mirzakhani-Wright the dimension of $\mathcal{M}'$ must be strictly smaller than the dimension of $\mathcal{M}$. It follows that p is a periodic point on (Y, η). However, no such points exist on translation surfaces of genus greater than two with a zero of order one. Therefore, it follows that (X, ω) cannot belong to an even component.

We can now revise our picture. The marked point is contained in one of the two configurations shown in Figure 18.



(A) The periodic point borders an order 2 zero

(B) The periodic point borders a zero of order 4 or more

FIGURE 18. Two possible configurations

In both cases, the vertical cylinder W intersects a unique horizontal cylinder H distinct from the central horizontal cylinder. By construction, H is $\mathcal{H}$-free and therefore it may be collapsed without moving the marked point p. The stratum moves from $\mathcal{H}(2k,\ldots)$ to $\mathcal{H}(0,2k-2,\ldots)$. Let $\mathcal{H}'$ be the new marked stratum. The result of the collapse is depicted in Figure 19.



(A) The surfaces collapses to $\mathcal{H}(0,0,\ldots)$

(B) The surfaces collapses to $\mathcal{H}(0,2k-2,\ldots)$

FIGURE 19. The result of collapsing H

Let $(Y,\eta;Q)$ be the boundary translation surface and let $\mathcal{M}'$ be its orbit closure. By Mirzakhani-Wright $\mathcal{M}'$ is a proper affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{H}'$. The genericity criterion implies that forgetting p is a generic marked translation surface. The induction hypothesis implies that $\mathcal{H}'$ is a hyperelliptic component of a stratum of translation surfaces with two or three marked points.

Suppose first that there are two marked points on $(Y,\eta;Q)$. The induction hypothesis implies that either exactly one of the marked points is a Weierstrass point or the points are exchanged by the hyperelliptic involution. Since W may be dilated so that both marked points lie on the same half of the cylinder $V\cup W$, neither case is possible and hence we have a contradiction.

Suppose now that there are three marked points on $(Y,\eta;Q)$. The induction hypothesis implies that either exactly one of the marked points is a Weierstrass point and the other two are generic or two marked points are exchanged by the hyperelliptic involution and one is generic. Again since W may be dilated, we see that no point can be a Weierstrass point. Since forgetting p leads to a generic marked translation surface it follows that the image of p under the hyperelliptic involution is one of the marked points. Since W may be dilated, it follows that the middle point is generic and V_a and V' have identical moduli.

Since there is a unique rational linear relation among the cylinders $\mathcal{M}$-equivalent to V_a, it must be that V_a and V' have identical moduli. It follows that all other vertical cylinders contained in C may be horizontally dilated independently of all other vertical cylinders.

If there is a vertical cylinder V'' that is contained in C and not equal to V or V' then we may collapse it to pass to the boundary and proceed as in the case where (X, ω) had an odd order zero. The only translation surfaces left to consider is the one in Figure 20:



FIGURE 20. The remaining translation surface

We have by symmetry that the modulus of V_a, V_b, and V' are all identical, which implies that the modulus of V is twice that of V'. This is impossible since we have assumed that there is no rational linear relation between the moduli of V and V'.

□

Proof of Main Theorem 1: Recall that $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ is the collection of translation surfaces in $\mathcal{H}$ with $n + m$ distinct points, m of which are labelled and n of which are unlabelled. Suppose that there is a measurable equivariant section f of the forgetful map from $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ to $\mathcal{H}(0^m, \emptyset)$. By the section lemma it follows that there is an affine invariant submanifold $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{H}(0^m, 0^n)$ so that the fiber over a point under the forgetful map from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{H}(0^m, \emptyset)$ has size either zero or one. Main Theorem 2 classifies all such affine invariant submanifolds. In particular, it says that $\mathcal{H}$ is hyperelliptic and the n unlabelled points may only contain Weierstrass points or points exchanged with one of m labelled points under the hyperelliptic involution. Let W be the collection of Weierstrass points that do not coincide with a zero of ω. It remains to show that either all the points in W are marked or none are.

We will work with a generic translation surface (X, ω) in a hyperelliptic component constructed in Section 4. Notice that every vertical and every horizontal cylinder contains exactly two points in W. This can be seen either by inspection of the figures in Section 4 or deduced from the fact that in hyperelliptic components, each cylinder is fixed by the hyperelliptic involution. This implies that the core curve of every cylinder is taken by an orientation reversing homeomorphism to itself. Every orientation reversing map of the circle to itself has exactly two fixed points.

The tangent space of (X, ω) in $\mathcal{H}$ contains a Dehn twist in each horizontal and vertical cylinder. The action of these Dehn twists on W is a transposition that exchanges the two points in W contained in the cylinder. These transpositions generate the symmetric group on the points in W. This establishes the claim when $m = 0$.

Let Q be a collection of m distinct labelled points that lie in the interior of no vertical cylinder and lie in the interior of a horizontal cylinder H that only intersects one vertical

cylinder. Suppose moreover that the points in Q lie at irrational height that satisfy no rational linear relation. In particular, there is a vertical line that contains all the points in Q. That line also contains a Weierstrass point w_1. Let w_2 be the other Weierstrass point contained in H. The Dehn twist argument in the previous paragraph shows that the monodromy group over $(X, \omega; Q)$ contains $\mathrm{Sym}(W - \{w_1\})$. Therefore, to finish this argument it suffices to show that monodromy group over $(X, \omega; Q)$ contains the transposition that exchanges w_1 and w_2.

Let T be the Dehn twist about the core curve of H realized as a shearing matrix applied to H (as in Section 5). By Corollary 5.4, shearing H remains in $\mathcal{A}$. Since the points in Q lie at irrational heights that satisfy no rational linear relation, their orbit is dense on the horizontal lines that they lie on. In particular, this remains true for their orbit under T^{2k+1}. Since T^{2k+1} swaps w_1 and w_2 and the points in Q return arbitrarily close to their original positions, we see that the monodromy group must contain the transposition that exchanges w_1 and w_2.

Since the monodromy group over $(X, \omega; Q)$ contains $\mathrm{Sym}(W)$ it follows that if k of the n labelled points are points in W, then for every subset S of W of size k there is a marked translation surface in the fiber of $(X, \omega; Q)$ where the points in S are marked. Since the fiber has size one it follows that either no points in W are marked or all of them are. $\square$

7. Marked Points on Branched Covering Constructions

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a stratum of abelian differentials perhaps with marked points. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an affine invariant submanifold in a stratum of unmarked abelian differentials. Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ is a branched covering construction over $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{H}(0^m)$ where the pushforward of $\mathcal{N}$ to $\mathcal{H}$ is $\mathcal{H}$. Without loss of generality suppose that if $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperelliptic component then the marked points B on each marked translation surface in $\mathcal{N}$ contain all the Weierstrass points and all points exchanged with the labelled points under the hyperelliptic involution. By Section 3 of [1] there are finite equivariant covering maps

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} & & \\ & \overset{\pi_1}{\swarrow} & & \overset{\pi_2}{\searrow} & \\ \mathcal{N} & & & & \mathcal{M} \end{array}$$

Each point in $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ determines a translation surface (X, ω) in $\mathcal{H}$, a translation surface (Y, η) in $\mathcal{M}$, a holomorphic map $f : Y \longrightarrow X$ such that $f^*\omega = \eta$, and a collection of points B so that f is branched over $B \cup Z(\omega)$ where $Z(\omega)$ is the zero set of ω. Recall that $\overline{\mathcal{N}(0^n)}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}(0^n)}$ denote the partial compactification of strata of marked points where marked points are allowed to coincide with each other and with zeros. Both of these bundles pull back to $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$. There is an equivariant map $F : (\pi_2)^*\overline{\mathcal{M}(0^n)} \longrightarrow (\pi_1)^*\overline{\mathcal{N}(0^n)}$ that sends the point $(f : (Y, \eta) \longrightarrow (X, \omega); p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ to $(f : (Y, \eta) \longrightarrow (X, \omega); f(p_1), \ldots, f(p_n))$. The situation is summarized by the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \overline{\mathcal{N}(0^n)} & \overset{\pi_1}{\longleftarrow} & (\pi_1)^*\overline{\mathcal{N}(0^n)} & \overset{F}{\longleftarrow} & (\pi_2)^*\overline{\mathcal{M}(0^n)} & \overset{\pi_2}{\longrightarrow} & \overline{\mathcal{M}(0^n)} \\ & \searrow & & \swarrow & & \searrow & \\ & & \mathcal{N} & \overset{\pi_1}{\longleftarrow} & \widetilde{\mathcal{N}} & \overset{\pi_2}{\longrightarrow} & \mathcal{M} & \leftarrow & \end{array}$$

Lemma 7.1. *Let (Y,η) be a generic translation surface in $\mathcal{M}$ with two marked points p and q. Suppose that $f_i : (Y,\eta) \longrightarrow (X_i,\omega_i,B_i)$ for $i = 1,2$ are translation coverings of marked translation surfaces in $\mathcal{N}$; then p is f_1-periodic if and only if it is f_2-periodic and p and q are f_1-related if and only if they are f_2-related.*

Proof. Let p be f_1-periodic. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the orbit closure of $(f_1 : (Y,\eta,p) \longrightarrow (X_1,\omega_1,B_1;f_1(p)))$. Since p is f_1-periodic, the dimension of $\mathcal{A}$ coincides with the dimension of $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathcal{B} = (\pi_2)^* (\pi_2)_* \mathcal{A}$, which is a closed affine invariant submanifold of the same dimension as $\mathcal{A}$ and containing the points $(f_i : (Y,\eta,p) \longrightarrow (X_i,\omega_i,B_i;f_i(p)))$ for $i = 1,2$. The push-forward of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\overline{\mathcal{N}(0)}$ must have the same dimension as $\mathcal{N}$ and so $(X_i,\omega_i,B_i;f_i(p))$ is a periodic point for $i = 1,2$. The argument for f_i-related points is essentially identical. □

Theorem (Main Theorem 4)**.** *The proper affine invariant submanifolds of $\mathcal{M}(0^m,0^n)$ that push forward to $\mathcal{M}$ are constructed by marking f-periodic points and/or by marking two points that are f-related.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{M}(0^{k_1},0^{k_2})$ is a quotient of $\mathcal{M}^{ord}(0^n)$ by a subgroup of the symmetric group, it suffices to prove the claim for $\mathcal{M}^{ord}(0^n)$ where $n = k_1 + k_2$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a proper affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{M}^{ord}(0^n)$ that pushes forward to $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathcal{B} = (\pi_1 F)_* (\pi_2)^* \mathcal{A}$, which is a proper affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{N}^{ord}(0^n)$ that pushes forward to $\mathcal{N}$. By Main Theorem 2, $\mathcal{B}$ is constructed by marking periodic points or points exchanged under the hyperelliptic involution. Let $\mathcal{A}' = (\pi_2)_* (\pi_1 F)^* \mathcal{B}$, which is a proper affine invariant submanifold in $\mathcal{M}^{ord}(0^n)$ containing $\mathcal{A}$, and where the affine invariant submanifold is constructed by specifying certain points that are f-periodic and certain pairs of points that are f-related. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is contained in $\mathcal{A}'$ the result follows . □

It follows immediately that all measurable equivariant sections of the forgetful map from $\mathcal{M}(0^m,0^n)$ to $\mathcal{M}(0^m,\emptyset)$ are constructed by marking a collection of f-periodic points and/or by marking a collection of points that are f-related to one of the m labelled points.

8. Finite Blocking and Illumination Problems

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a connected component of a stratum of abelian differentials. As in the previous section let $\mathcal{M}$ be an affine invariant submanifold that is constructed from a branched covering construction of $\mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N}$ is an affine invariant submanifold of $\mathcal{H}(0^n)$ that pushes forward to $\mathcal{H}$ under the forgetful map. Since the proofs are similar, we will prove Main Theorem 3 and Corollary 3 simultaneously in this section. Our main tools will be Main Theorem 1 and the following result:

Theorem (Lemma 7(III), Leliévre, Monteil, and Weiss [9])**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}_n$ be the collection of points $(X,\omega;p_1,p_2) \in \mathcal{M}(0^2)$ such that p_1 and p_2 are distinct points that are finitely blocked by a blocking set of size less than or equal to n; $\mathcal{B}_n$ is a closed invariant set.*

Suppose that (Y,η) is an $\mathcal{M}$-generic translation surface and that $f : (Y,\eta) \longrightarrow (X,\omega;B)$ is a finite covering map.

Proposition 8.1. *Two distinct points p and q on a generic translation surface (X,ω) in a component $\mathcal{H}$ of a stratum of abelian differentials are finitely blocked if and only if $\mathcal{H}$ is hyperelliptic and p and q are exchanged by the hyperelliptic involution.*

Proof. Since the orbit closure $\mathcal{M}$ of $(X, \omega; p, q)$ pushes forward to $\mathcal{H}$ under the forgetful map and is contained in $\mathcal{B}_n$, which is a proper affine invariant submanifold, it follows that $\mathcal{H}$ is a hyperelliptic component and either p and q are exchanged by the hyperelliptic involution or one of them is a Weierstrass point.

Suppose first that p and q are Weierstrass points. We have already seen that the $\mathrm{GL}_2\mathbb{R}$ orbit of $(X, \omega; S \cup \{p, q\})$, for any set S, accumulates on a generic surface constructed in Section 4 where p and q are contained in a horizontal cylinder H and all points in S are not contained in H. In a neighborhood of this point, p and q are not finitely blocked by the points in S, which implies that p and q are not finitely blocked by S for any blocking set S.

Suppose now that q is a Weierstrass point and p is not. The $\mathrm{GL}_2\mathbb{R}$ orbit of $(X, \omega, S \cup \{p, q\})$, for any finite set S, accumulates on a generic surface constructed in Section 4 where p and q are contained in a horizontal cylinder and the only other points of S that are contained in that cylinder is another Weierstrass point and the image of p under the hyperelliptic involution. Again, p and q are not blocked by the points of S in a neighborhood of this point and so S is not a finite blocking set for any finite set S.

If neither p nor q are Weierstrass points, then they are exchanged by the hyperelliptic involution. Let ℓ be any line between p and q. If ℓ is fixed by the hyperelliptic involution, then it contains a fixed point of the hyperelliptic involution, i.e. a Weierstrass point. Otherwise, the union of ℓ and its image under the hyperelliptic involution is a line that connects p to itself, passes through q, and does not pass through any singularity of the flat metric. This line is the core curve of a cylinder in the flat metric and the hyperelliptic involution takes all core curves of cylinders to themselves in an orientation reversing way. Any orientation reversing homeomorphism of the circle to itself has exactly two fixed points, i.e. Weierstrass points. This again implies that ℓ contains a Weierstrass point. Therefore, the Weierstrass points form a finite blocking set. □

Corollary (Corollary 3)**.** *If p and q are two (not necessarily distinct) points in (Y, η), then p and q are finitely blocked from each other only if they are both f-periodic or if they are f-related.*

Proof. If p and q are identified under f, then they are f-related. We will discard this possibility and suppose that $p \neq q$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the orbit closure of $(Y, \eta; p, q)$. Since $\mathcal{B}_n$ never coincides with $\mathcal{M}^{ord}(0^2)$ it follows that $\mathcal{A}$ is a proper affine invariant submanifold of $\mathcal{M}^{ord}(0^2)$ that pushes forward to $\mathcal{M}$ under the forgetful map. By Main Theorem 4 it follows that either p and q are f-related or one of them is f-periodic.

Suppose to a contradiction that p is f-periodic and q is not. It follows that q is finitely blocked from every point in $(Y, \eta) - \{q\}$. In particular, there is a finite collection S of points so that every point that is f-related to p is blocked from q by S. This means that $f(p)$ is finitely blocked from $f(q)$. By Proposition 8.1 this cannot occur. □

Theorem (Main Theorem 3)**.** *Two points on a generic translation surface in a component of a stratum are finitely blocked if and only if the component is a hyperelliptic component and the two points are images of each other under the hyperelliptic involution. The minimal blocking set is the collection of Weierstrass points.*

Corollary 8.2. *Any two points on a generic translation surface illuminate each other.*

Proof of Main Theorem 3: By Proposition 8.1, it suffices to determine which points may be finitely blocked from themselves. Suppose that S is a set that blocks p from itself. The orbit of the translation surface and the points $\{p\} \cup S$ accumulate on a generic translation surface constructed in Section 4. If the component is not hyperelliptic we may suppose that p is contained in the interior of the central horizontal cylinder and all the points in S are not. If the component is hyperelliptic we may suppose that p is contained in a horizontal cylinder and the only other points of S contained in the central horizontal cylinder are its image under the hyperelliptic involution and the two Weierstrass points. Moreover, if p is not a periodic point we will assume that it does not lie at the same height as a Weierstrass point. We see that in a neighborhood of this marked translation surface p is blocked from itself by S only if the component is hyperelliptic and p is a Weierstrass point blocked from itself by the other Weierstrass point in the cylinder containing p. Immediately we have that claim that all points illuminate themselves.

Suppose now that p is a Weierstrass point. If ℓ is any line that does not pass through a zero and that connects p to itself, we see that ℓ is core curve of a cylinder. Since the hyperelliptic involution sends all core curves of cylinders to themselves by orientation reversing homeomorphisms, it follows that there is another fixed point of the hyperelliptic involution on ℓ, i.e. another Weierstrass point. Therefore, p is blocked from itself by the collection of Weierstrass points.

In the proof of Main Theorem 1 we saw that if p and q are images of each other under the hyperelliptic involution, then the monodromy over $(X, \omega; \{p, q\})$ acts transitively on the collection of Weierstrass points W that are not a zero of ω and excluding points in $\{p, q\}$. It follows that if a blocking set contains a Weierstrass point in W, it contains every point in W. The argument here and in Proposition 8.1 show that the blocking set of p and q must contain a Weierstrass point. Therefore, the minimal blocking set of p and q is unique and is W. □

References

[1] Paul Apisa. GL(2,R) orbit closures in hyperelliptic components of strata. preprint, arXiv:1508.05438 (2015).

[2] Artur Avila, Alex Eskin, and Martin Möller. Symplectic and Isometric $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$-invariant subbundles of the Hodge bundle. preprint, arXiv 1209.2854 (2012).

[3] Clifford J. Earle and Irwin Kra. On sections of some holomorphic families of closed Riemann surfaces. *Acta Math.*, 137(1-2):49–79, 1976.

[4] Alex Eskin and Maryam Mirzakhani. Invariant and stationary measures for the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ action on moduli space. preprint, arXiv 1302.3320 (2013).

[5] Alex Eskin, Maryam Mirzakhani, and Amir Mohammadi. Isolation theorems for $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$-invariant submanifolds in moduli space. preprint, arXiv:1305.3015 (2013).

[6] John Hubbard. Sur la non-existence de sections analytiques à la courbe universelle de Teichmüller. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 274:A978–A979, 1972.

[7] P. Hubert, M. Schmoll, and S. Troubetzkoy. Modular fibers and illumination problems. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (8):Art. ID rnn011, 42, 2008.

[8] Maxim Kontsevich and Anton Zorich. Connected components of the moduli spaces of Abelian differentials with prescribed singularities. *Invent. Math.*, 153(3):631–678, 2003.

[9] Samuel Leliévre, Thierry Monteil, and Barak Weiss. Everything is illuminated. preprint, arXiv:1407.2975 (2014).
[10] Maryam Mirzakhani and Alex Wright. The boundary of an affine invariant submanifold. preprint, arXiv:1508.01446 (2015).
[11] Martin Möller. Periodic points on Veech surfaces and the Mordell-Weil group over a Teichmüller curve. *Invent. Math.*, 165(3):633–649, 2006.
[12] Terrence Tao. The closed graph theorem in various categories. *Retrieved Dec. 12, 2015 from terrytao.wordpress.com/2012/11/20/the-closed-graph-theorem-in-various-categories*.
[13] Alex Wright. Cylinder deformations in orbit closures of translation surfaces. *Geom. Topol.*, 19(1):413–438, 2015.
[14] Anton Zorich. Flat surfaces. In *Frontiers in number theory, physics, and geometry. I*, pages 437–583. Springer, Berlin, 2006.

Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60615
E-mail address: paul.apisa@gmail.com